A U M

I have crossed beyond that very impassable place, in which the fancies are the gadflies and mosquitos, in which grief and joy are cold and heat, in which delusion is the blinding darkness, avarice the beasts of prey and reptiles, desire and anger the obstructors, the way to which consists in worldly objects, and is to be crossed by one alone; and I have entered the great forest.—*Anugita.*

THEOSOPHY

Vol. VII JUNE, 1919 No. 8

No Theosophical Society, as such, is responsible for any opinion or declaration in this magazine, by whomsoever expressed, unless contained in an official document.

Where any article, or statement, has the author's name attached, he alone is responsible, and for those which are unsigned, the Editors will be accountable.

OF OCCULT PRACTICES

IN the Far East there have been, from time immemorial, teachers, students and practitioners of secret arts and sciences having to do with the inner nature of man and all things. "Fakir" and "Yogi" have become familiar words.

The Semitic and Arabic peoples have pursued similar cults. Witches, soothsayers and those with a "familiar spirit," as well as prophets, are of frequent mention in the Bible; and the Talmud, as well as the more modernly known Kabala, refer to occultism; while the Sufi sect and the "whirling dervishes" amongst Mohammedans have both their literature and their magical rites.

Egypt is full of remnant records of occultism, of which the "Book of the Dead" is the best known in the West. Greece and Rome had their Eleusinian and Bacchic celebrants, as well as their philosophers who treated of the "mysteries;" their sybils and divinations.

Side by side with the practices of the Roman Catholic Church, which are based on the lore of old magic, there is historical record of seers, saints, rosicrucianism, "fire philosophers," diabolism and mysticism, through the centuries of the "Christian era" down to the present day.

The fairy stories, myths, folk-lore and traditions of all peoples, savage as well as civilized, deal with magicians good and bad, with invisible entities, with strange and portentous powers and events.

In modern European and American history we have the outbreaks of "witchcraft," the exercise of baneful powers alongside of such characters as Anton Mesmer, Count de Saint-Germain and Cagliostro. We have Cotton Mather, Swedenborg, Martin Luther,

Roger Bacon, Robert Fludd and Paracelsus, treating of debased as well as of beneficent forces and beings, of worlds invisible as well as visible. The list might be prolonged indefinitely.

Within the period of men and women still living we have witnessed the rise and spread of the cult of modern spiritualism, of new thought, of Christian Science, of psychical research. All these have to do with the study and practice of mysterious powers and functions in Nature and in man. They all relate to occult art and science in one form or another.

Bearing all this in mind, we can gather something of what is implied in the following quotation from *Isis Unveiled,* published in 1877, and written by H. P. Blavatsky:

> "Magic, as a science, is the knowledge of the way by which the omniscience and omnipotence of the Spirit and its control over nature's forces may be acquired by the individual while still in the body. Magic, as an art, is the application of this knowledge in practice.
>
> Arcane knowledge misapplied, is sorcery; beneficently used, true magic or WISDOM.
>
> Mediumship is the opposite of adeptship; the medium is the passive instrument of foreign influences, the adept actively controls himself and all inferior potencies.
>
> All things that ever were, that are, or that will be, having their record upon the astral light, or tablet of the unseen universe, the initiated adept, by using the vision of his own spirit, can know all that has been known or can be known.
>
> Races of men differ in spiritual gifts as in color, stature, or any other external quality; among some peoples seership naturally prevails, among others mediumship. Some are addicted to sorcery, and transmit its secret rules of practice from generation to generation, with a range of psychical phenomena, more or less wide, as the result."

There is here indicated the two great divisions of Nature: the Active and the Passive poles of everything. This applies just as much to occult powers and knowledge as to anything else. On the one hand there is Adeptship; on the other, Mediumship, as defined above.

Each of these is likewise dual in its own nature: Adeptship may be White or Black, beneficent or maleficent; Mediumship may be a blessing or a curse. Adeptship is acquired by self-control; mediumship by self-surrender. Manifestly, then the words Adeptship and Mediumship refer and relate to the methods followed, no less than to the results achieved; while Black and White, good and bad, adeptship or mediumship relate to the motives inspiring the efforts made by the aspirants as well as to the effects experienced.

A little study and examination, a little comparison, of the records available to anyone who is interested, will soon make clear to

him some very valuable lessons. One is that Adeptship, and the road to it, is and always has been secret. The most that can be said to be ascertainable is that there is good reason for believing that Adepts, both Black and White, have always existed and now exist, and that they have their schools and pupils. But the world knows them not, nor have their respective secrets ever been exposed or betrayed, nor has any inquisitive effort, however prolonged or ably conducted, ever in recorded history, been able to spy upon them or do more than suspect and speculate about MAGIC, or about Magicians.

Another lesson soon seen is that all that the world knows anything at all about is *Mediumship*. The prophets and seers of religious history, Christian and "Heathen," have all been mediums; just as much mediums as the most ordinary "sensitive" or "psychic" of the present day, or any of the "soothsayers," "witches," or "sybils" of earlier times. Some have been more perfect mediums than others, each has differed from others in the nature of his "control," or "obsession," or "familiar spirit," and consequently in the extent and variety of the "phenomena" he has been the passive agent of. And they have differed enormously in their moral nature, these "mediums," and so their "messages" and "miracles," their "visions" and "prophecies" have also greatly differed. Some have proved true, others false. Some have been wise, others foolish; some helpful, others harmful. All depends on the character of the medium and the nature of the mediumship. But mediumship it is, for no one of them could himself tell in advance whether any given effort at exercising his mediumship would succeed or fail; no one of them knew in advance what he was going to say or do; no one of them while saying or doing, knew what it was he was delivering, or could exercise any control over the forces working through him. Not one of them could exercise his "powers" *at will,* or refrain from exercising them when "the word of the Lord" came to him, or his "control" took "possession" of him.

These are the *basic* facts regarding both Adeptship and Mediumship.

The countless sects in the various religions, the degeneracy of those religions themselves, are all due to mediumship. This, that, and the other disciple or subsequent devotee, falling consciously or unconsciously into those practices conducive to mediumship, developed one or another of the "gifts" which appertain to mediumship, and, the necessary conditions having been set up, became the recipient of one or another of the many sorts of "personal psychological experiences" which to him were the very "Word of God" or some other high and holy Being, angel, saint or what not, accepted it as a "revelation," and forthwith acquired his own little ripple or current of followers in the larger stream of the general "faith."

A third lesson that becomes clear is, that all the great religions and philosophies themselves were, in their origin, the output of one

or another great Adept in true MAGIC, or Spiritual Wisdom; only the degeneration of the original teachings is due to mediumship. The evidence of this unity of origin of all the great world faiths, and the character of the Beings who founded them, is to be discerned in the fundamental Unity of their teachings regarding God, Nature and Man, and the right and true practices to be followed by those who would approach the temple of Divine Truth; and as well by the fact that all these great Adepts and Teachers were able to perform, and did perform, beneficent phenomena *at will,* and of such a recondite nature as regards their causation that the whole of those before whom they were performed could only regard them as a miracle or a fraud. All these great Adepts were uniformly regarded by their followers, at the time and later, as Divine Beings, and subsequently were deified and worshipped. The fact that many mediums have also been worshipped or looked upon as Adepts by the multitude, does not alter that other fact that the Founders were of another Order from any of those who afterwards spoke "in their names."

The evidence of mediumship is the passivity of the oracle; the evidence of the uncertain and unreliable character of *any* mediumship, is the contradictions and discrepancies in the utterance and actions of any given medium with other utterances and actions of the same medium, as well as similar contradictions and discrepancies of all mediums with each other. The evidence of Adeptship is the self-mastery of the oracle; the evidence of the certain and reliable character of any adeptship is the consistency and concordancy of utterances and actions, whether of any given Adept, or of all the great Adepts of all the great religions and philosophies.

There is much more that might be said upon the subject of Magic; of Adeptship and Mediumship, and doubtless from time to time we may profitably continue the discussion. But it is believed that ample has been said and indicated herein to give all sincere seekers and earnest students food for thought and subject for investigation on their own account.

FROM ISIS UNVEILED*

Physical man, as a product of evolution, may be left in the hands of the man of exact science. None but he can throw light upon the *physical* origin of the race. But, we must positively deny the materialist the same privilege as to the question of man's psychical and spiritual evolution, for he and his highest faculties *cannot* be proved on any conclusive evidence to be "as much products of evolution as the humblest plant or the lowest worm."

* Original Edition, Vol. I, p. 153.

OCCULT OR EXACT SCIENCE?*

About ten years ago, when *Isis Unveiled* was being written, the most important point the work aimed at was the demonstration of the following: (*a*) the reality of the *Occult* in nature; (*b*) the thorough knowledge of, and familiarity with, all such occult domains amongst "certain men," and their mastery therein; (*c*) hardly an art or science known in our age, that the *Vedas* have not mentioned; and (*d*) that hundreds of things, especially mysteries of nature,—*in abscondito* as the alchemists called it,—were known to the Aryas of the *premahabarata* period, which are unknown to us, the modern sages of the XIXth century.

A new proof of it is now being given. It comes as a fresh corroboration, from some recent investigations in France by learned *"specialists"* (?) with regard to the confusion made by their *neurosists* and *psychomaniacs* between colour and sound, *"musical impressions"* and *colour-impressions.*

This special phenomenon was first approached in Austria in 1873 by Dr. Newbamer. After him it began to be seriously investigated in Germany by Blaver and Lehmann; in Italy by Vellardi, Bareggi and a few others, and it was finally and quite recently taken up by Dr. Pedronneau of France. The most interesting accounts of *colour-sound* phenomena may, however, be found in *La Nature,* (No. 626, 1885, pp. 406, *et seq*) in an article contributed by A. de Rochat who experimented with a certain gentleman whom he names Mr. "N. R."

The following is a short *resumé* of his experience.

N. R. is a man of about 57 years of age, an *advocate* by profession, now living in one of the country *faubourgs* of Paris, a passionate amateur of natural sciences which he has studied very seriously, fond of music, though no musician himself, a great traveller and as great a linguist. N. R. had never read anything about that peculiar phenomenon that makes certain people associate sound with colour, but was subject to it from his very boyhood. Sound of every description had always generated in him the impression of colours. Thus the articulation of the vowels produces in his brain the following results:—The letter *A*—appears to him dark red; *E*—white; *I*—black; *O*—yellow; *U*—blue. The double-vowelled letters; *Ai*—chestnut colour; *Ei*—greyish white; *Eu*—light blue; *Oi*—dirty-yellow; *Ou*—yellowish. The consonants are nearly all of a dark gray hue; while a vowel, or a double vowel forming with a consonant a syllable, colours that syllable with its own tint. Thus, *ba, ca, da* are all of red-grey colour; *bi, ci, di* ash coloured; *bo, co, do* yellow grey, and so on. *S* ending a word and pronounced in a hissing way, like the Spanish words *los compos,* imparts to the syllable that precedes it a metallic glittering. The colour of the word depends

*This article, together with the preceding installment which appeared in THEOSOPHY last month, was first printed by H. P. Blavatsky in *The Theosophist* for April, 1886.

thus on the colour of the letters that compose it, so that to N. R. human speech appears in the shape of many coloured, or variegated ribbon coming out of persons' mouths, the colours of which are determined by those of the vowels in the sentences, separated one from the other by the greyish stripes of the consonants.

The languages receive in their turn a common colouring from those letters that predominate in each. For instance, the German, which abounds in consonants, forms on the whole the impression of a dark grey moss; French appears grey, strongly mixed with white; the English seems nearly black; Spanish is very much coloured especially with yellow and carmine-red tints; Italian is yellow, merging into carmine and black, but with more delicate and harmonious tints than the Spanish.

A deep-toned voice impresses N. R. with a dark red colour which gradually passes into a chocolate hue; while a shrill, sonorous voice suggests the blue colour, and a voice between these two extremes changes these colours immediately into very light yellow.

The sounds of instruments have also their distinct and special colours: the piano and the flute suggest tints of blue; the violin—black; and the guitar—silver grey, etc.

The names of musical notes pronounced loudly, influence N. R. in the same manner as the words. The colours of a singing voice and playing depend upon the voice and its compass and altitude, and upon the instrument played on.

So it is with *figures* verbally pronounced; but when read mentally they reflect for him the colour of the ink they are written or printed with. The form, therefore, has nought to do with such colour phenomena. While these impressions do not generally take place outside of himself, but perform, so to say, on the platform of his brain, we find other sensitives offering far more curious phenomena than "N. R." does.

Besides Galton's interesting chapter upon this subject, in his "Inquiries into Human Faculty and its Development," we find in the *London Medical Record* a sensitive describing his impressions in this wise: "As soon as I *hear* the sounds of a guitar, I *see* vibrating chords, surrounded by coloured vapours." The piano produces the same: "coloured images begin to float over the keys." One of Dr. Pedronneau's subjects in Paris* has always colour impressions *outside* of himself. "Whenever I hear a chorus composed of several voices," he says, "I *feel* a great number of coloured points floating over the heads of the singers. I *feel* them, for my eye receives no definite impression; nevertheless, I am compelled to *look* at them, and while *examining* them I feel perplexed, for I cannot find those bright coloured spots where I *look* at them, or rather *feel* them."

Inversely, there are sensitives in whom the sight of colours evokes immediately that of sounds, and others again, in whom a triple

* *Annales d'Oculistique*, Nov. and Dec. 1882.—*Journal de Medicine de l'Ouest*, 4me. Trimestre, 1882.

phenomenon is produced by one special sense generating two other senses. A certain sensitive cannot hear a brass band without a taste "like copper in the mouth" during the performance, and seeing dark golden clouds.

Science investigates such manifestations, recognizes their reality, and—remains powerless to explain them. *"Neurosis* and *hysteria"* is the only answer obtained, and the *"canine* hallucinations" of the French academicians quoted in *Isis,* have remained valid to this day as an explanation, or a *universal solvent* of all such phenomena. But it is only natural after all, that science should be unable to account at any rate for this particular phenomenon of *light* and *sound,* since their theory of light itself has never been fully verified, nor made complete to the present day.

Let then our scientific opponents play for a while longer at "blind man's buff" amongst phenomena, with no ground to stand upon but their eternal physiological hypotheses. The time is not perhaps far off when they shall be compelled to change their tactics or—confess themselves defeated by even such *elementary* phenomena as described above. But, whatever physiologists may, or may not say, or do; whatever their scientific explanations, hypotheses and conclusions at present or in the future, modern phenomena, are fast *cycling* back for their true explanation, to the archaic *Vedas,* and other "Sacred Books of the East." For it is an easy matter to show, that the Vedic Aryans were quite familiar with all such mysteries of sound and colour. *Mental* correlations of the two senses of "sight" and "hearing" were as common a fact in their days, as that of a man in our own seeing objective things before him with eyes wide open at noon.

Any student of Occultism, the youngest of *chelas* who has just begun reading *esoterically* his Vedas, can suspect what the real phenomenon means; simply—*a cyclic return of human organisms to their primitive form* during the 3rd and even the 4th Root Races of what is known as the *Antediluvian periods.* Everything conspires to prove it, even the study of such exact sciences as philology and comparative mythology. From the hoary days of antiquity, from the very dawn of the grand civilizations of those races that preceded our *Fifth* Race, and the traces of which now lie buried at the very bottom of the oceans, the fact in question was known. That which is now considered as an abnormal phenomena, was in every probability the normal state of the antediluvian Humanity. These are no vain words, for here are two of the many proofs.

In consequence of the abundant data gleaned by linguistic research, philologists are beginning to raise their voices and are pointing to some very suggestive, though as yet unexplained facts. (1) All the words indicative of human representations and conceptions of *light* and *sound* are *found to have their derivation from the same roots.** (2) *Mythology* shows, in her turn, the evident law—the

---

* *Introduction à la Mythologie de l'Odyssée.* "Voyvodsky."

uniformity of which precludes the possibility of chance—that led the ancient symbologists to represent all their *sun*-gods and *radiant* deities—such as the Dawn, the Sun, or Aurora, Phœbus, Apollo, etc.—connected in one way or the other with music and singing,—with *sound* in short,—associated with radiancy and colour.[1]

If this is as yet but an inference, there exists a still better proof in the *Vedas*, for there the conceptions of the words "sound" and "light," "to hear" and "to see," *are always associated*. In Hymn X, 71, verse 4, we read "One—though *looking, sees not the speech*, and the other *seeing*—does not *hear* it." And again in verse 7th, in which a party of friends is represented as emulating each other in singing, they are charactered by the double epithet placed side by side: *Akshavanta* and *Karnavanta*, or "one furnished with eyes" and "one furnished with ears." The latter is natural—the singer has *a good ear for music*, and the epithet is comprehensible in view of the musical emulation. But what sense can the *Akshavanta* have in this case, with his good sight, unless there is a connection and a meaning in it that are not explained, because probably the hymn refers to days when *sight* and *hearing* were synonymous terms? Moreover, a philologist, a rising Orientalist, tells[2] us that "the Sanskrit verbal root ARC is used to denote two meanings—(*a*) "to *sing*," and (*b*) "to *shine*," to radiate beams or rays. The substantives *rc* and *arka*, derived from the root ARC are used to signify (1) *song, hymn*, and (2) *brilliancy*, ray, sun. . . . In the conception of the ancients *a speech could be seen* . . . he explains. What does the Esoteric Doctrine,—that universal solvent indeed of all scientific difficulties and puzzles—say to this? It sends us to the chapter on the *Evolution of Races*, in which primitive man is shown in his special evolution advancing on the physical plane by developing a sense in each successive sub-race (of which there are seven) of the 1st Root-race during the 4th Round on this globe.[3] *Human* speech, as known to us, came into being in the Root-race that preceded ours—the *Fourth* or the "Atlantean"—at the very beginning of it, in sub-race No. 1; and simultaneously with it were developed *sight*—as a physical sense—while the four other senses (with the two additional—the 6th and 7th—of which science knows nothing as yet)—remained in their latent, undeveloped state as physical senses, although fully developed as spiritual faculties. Our sense of *hearing* developed only in the 3rd sub-races. Thus, if human "speech"—owing to that absence of the sense of hearing—was in the beginning even less than what we would call a whispered speech, for it was a mental articulation of sounds rather than anything else, something like the systems we now see worked out for the Deaf and Dumb, still it is easy to understand how, even from those early days, "speech" became associated with "sight," or, in other words, people could understand each other and *talk* with the

---

[1] *Essay on the Bacchic Cults of the Indo-European Nations.*

[2] Professor Ovseniko Koulikovsky, the Author of the Essay on "Bacchic Cults."

[3] See *Esoteric Buddhism*—for the Rounds, World-periods, and Sub-races. The chapter referred to will appear in the *Secret Doctrine*, which will shortly be published.

help of only *sight* and *touch*. "Sound is *seen* before it is heard,"—says the Book of *Kiu-ti*. The flash of lightning precedes the clap of thunder. As ages went by mankind fell with every new generation lower and lower *into matter*, the physical smothering the spiritual, until the whole set of senses—that had formed during the first three Root-races but one SENSE, namely, *spiritual perception*—finally fell asunder to form henceforth five distinct senses. . . .

But we are in the 5th race, and we have already passed the turning or *axial* point of our "sub-race cycle." Eventually as the current phenomena and the increase of sensitive organisms in our age go to prove, this Humanity will be moving swiftly on the path of pure spirituality, and will reach the apex (of *our* Race) at the end of the 7th sub-race. In plainer and *fuller* language—*plainer* and *fuller* to some theosophists only, I am afraid—we shall be, at that period, on the same degree of spirituality that belonged to, and was natural in, the 1st sub-race of the 3rd *Root-race* of the FOURTH Round; and the second half of it (or that half in which we now are) will be, owing to the law of correspondence, on parallel lines with the *first* half of the THIRD Round. In the words of one in whom live Truth and Wisdom—however often His words may have been misunderstood and criticised, not alone by profane critics but even by some theosophists,—"in the 1st half of the 3rd Round the primordial spirituality of man was eclipsed, because over-shadowed by nascent mentality;" Humanity was on its *descending arc* in the first half of that round and in the last half on its ascending arc: *i. e.*, "his (man's) *gigantic* stature had decreased and his body improved in texture; and he had become a more rational being though still more an ape than a *Deva*-man." And, if so, then, according to that same law of correspondences—an immutable one in the system of cycles—we have to infer the following:—that the latter half of our Round,—as shown to correspond with the 1st half of the 3rd,—must have already begun to be once more overshadowed by re-nascent "primordial" spirituality, which, at the end of the 4th Round, will have nearly eclipsed our actual mentality—in the sense of cold *human* Reason.

On the principle of that same law of correspondences,—as shall be shown and thoroughly explained in the forthcoming SECRET DOCTRINE—civilized humanity will soon begin to show itself, if even less "rational" *on the worldly plane*, at any rate more *Deva*-like than "ape-like"—as we now actually are, and that in the most distressing degree.

I may conclude with the remark, that since our natural and still "ape-like" propensities make us dread, individually and collectively, to be thrown by public opinion out of that region where all the smaller bodies gravitate toward the luminary of our social solar system—Science and her authority,—something has to be done to remedy such a disastrous state of things. I propose to show therefore, in my next, that as we are still only in the 5th sub-race of the Parent race, and none of us shall live to see the 7th—when

things shall mend naturally,—that it is just as well not to hang our hopes on science, whether orthodox or semi-heretical. The men of science cannot help the world to understand the *rationale* of phenomena, which for a little while longer in this cycle it will be quite impossible for them to account for, even to themselves. They can neither understand nor explain it, any more than any one else can, who has not studied occultism and the hidden laws that govern nature and rule mankind. The men of science are *helpless* in this case, and it is unjust to charge them with malice, or even with unwillingness—as has been often done. Their *rationality* (taken in this case in the sense of *intellectuality,* not of *reason*) can never permit them to turn their attention to occult study. Therefore it is useless to demand or expect from the learned men of our age that which they are absolutely incapable of doing for us, until the next cycle changes and transforms entirely their *inner* nature by "improving the texture" of their spiritual minds.

H. P. BLAVATSKY.

(To be continued.)

SOCRATES TEACHES A CHILD*

(Continued)

"Tell me," I broke out, suddenly, "what is it that really happens when one dies?"

"I do not know," he said. And this shocked me, for I had thought that of course he would know all about it. "But I do know this," he went on, "that no harm can ever come to any soul that always does what is right."

But I was sceptical now. "How can you know that," I demanded, "when you do not know what happens?"

"Have you ever thought why it is," he asked, "that some things are right and other things wrong?"

I had not, but I thought hard now. "It is right," I said, "when we do what the gods want us to."

"And if the gods should want us to do anything that is wrong, or if they should do anything wrong themselves—I do not say that they could—but would that make it right?"

"No!" I cried; for I thought bitterly of my mother, and how we had prayed for her in vain.

"Then right and wrong are something mightier than Jove himself."

"Yes," I answered. Again my spirit was humbled and now I knew why Alcibiades had spoken as he did. "Tell me about it, Socrates."

*This dialogue is an extract from "Gorgo", by Charles Kelsey Gaines, (Lothrop Publishing Company.) The book as a whole is one of the few notable and satisfactory reincarnation stories in print. The title given to the extract is ours.

"I will tell you, then, how it seems to me. To do right is to do what is truly wise. To do wrong is to make a mistake,—wilfully, perhaps, but that is because we think that we are truly wise when we are not. The gods alone are truly wise in everything, and that is why only the gods make no mistakes and never do wrong. If I say anything that you do not think is so, you must stop me."

"Don't stop," I said.

"Well, then, could any real harm come to a soul that is truly wise, and always does what is for the best and never makes mistakes—if that were possible? And it is possible, if we do not forget." He paused, but I did not speak. "And is not this the same as saying that nothing can ever harm the soul of one who does right and never does wrong, whatever may happen, now or hereafter? I do not think that we need to know just what it is that happens, little son of Hagnon."

"But there are such wicked men," I cried, "and if they catch you it isn't any use to be good."

"To be wicked," he said, "is the greatest of all mistakes. It is as if a general should think that all his friends were enemies, and all his enemies friends. A man who is wicked, like the Syrian, is sure to do terrible harm to himself; but he cannot harm any other, not even a child, like you, unless he is able to make him also wicked. And that he cannot do unless you help him; for it is not wrong to suffer what we cannot help, and no such thing ever really harms us. No, little one, the wicked cannot hurt the good."

"But they do hurt them," I insisted.

"Let us be sure that we understand each other," he said. "I do not speak altogether of what most people call harm and talk about as good and evil, not stopping to remember, but of what is really so. I know that the Syrian thought that he could harm us and meant to do it, and that you thought the same thing and feared him greatly; but you were both mistaken. In what way could he have hurt you?"

"He hurt my throat; and he might have killed me."

"If he had run a knife through your tunic, would that have hurt your body?"

"No, not if it was just the cloth that he cut."

"And even if he had cut the flesh and run a sharp knife right through the body, could he have hurt that part of you which is yourself, and does not die, and is only harmed by doing wrong? No, little one: it is very terrible to think about, but the worst that he could do, without your help, would be to tear or to pluck away its garment from the soul."

"And that is why you were not afraid when the black man lifted up his knife?"

"That is why," he answered.

We were passing now near the place where Alcibiades had rescued me. There was only the light of the stars, but I remembered the very stone against which I had leaned crying.

"Why did you not let them kill the Syrian?" I burst forth. "Oh, I wish they had killed him! And Alcibiades—he let him go, too!"

"Even Alcibiades does not always forget," he said. "Do you think it is doing right to kill people? Tell me just what you really think, son of Hagnon."

"He ought to be killed," I cried, hotly. "Oh, I wish they had trampled on him till he was spattered about like the grapes when they make them into wine!" And I gritted my teeth in sheer fury at the thought of him.

"It is true that he deserves punishment," said Socrates, so soberly that my pulses fell a little. "Do you think that he will not be punished? Is it not a frightful punishment, even now, to be just as he is, with that part of him that cannot die ruined and full of a dreadful poison? Yet if that does not seem to you to be enough, you need not fear lest that be all. Wrong always brings punishment—else it would not be wrong. That is the difference between things that are really wrong, and those things that many think are wrong which are not."

"He ought to be killed," I repeated; and the words still had a good relish.

"Men sometimes make blunders in their killings," he said; "and these, I fear, are very sad mistakes, especially for those who make them. From exile, if it is found to be unjust, a man may be recalled; but when the soul is driven out it cannot be called back. Are you sure, little boy, that you are so wise as to know always just who ought to be killed? and how he should be killed, and by whom, and when? I myself should fear to say."

"He ought to be killed," I said again, rolling the words on my tongue, but the flavour was not so good. And I went on: "You have killed men, haven't you—in battle, Socrates?"

"I obey the laws of my country. Yes, and I would have killed the Syrian to prevent him from killing you—or bearing you away, which would have been worse—but not otherwise. And if I should say to you, little one, as I said to him, that it is better to die than to kill another, would you too think it foolish, as he did? Would you be so much like him?"

The flavour was all gone now, but I still persisted: "He ought to be killed."

Then Socrates breathed so wearily that I thought he must be tired with carrying me so far; but he did not set me down.

"Little son of Hagnon," he said, "I see that we cannot agree in this; but you are only like all the rest." He continued, but I felt that it was no longer to me that he was speaking: "Many times and in many places have I said this thing with all the skill I knew—that it is never right to do wrong, not even to those who do wrong

to us—but they are all like this little child; no one of them ever understood. From words I know well that none will ever learn it; and even if one should proclaim this truth by deeds, and give up his own life before them to those who had wronged him, and should go to his death in perfect patience, seeking only to show them the way, still how few would understand! In all Athens, I think, not one,—not my dear, slow-minded Crito, who loves me better than himself, nor this keen-witted, perilous Alcibiades, who at least loves my words, nor any other of them all; and those who knew me best would be most eager to avenge me!" He sighed. "To this, no doubt, it will come at last; and perhaps, when the appointed time is reached, those hours of death will yet speak more truth to the souls of men than all these days and years of ceaseless questioning,—to the gods I commit it. And meanwhile, not without my joy, I follow the path that lies before my feet, and obey the mandate of the god, and heed the voice that ever warns and guides me through all the windings of the way up to the gate of death."

"Why do you talk like that, Socrates?" I breathed it in his ear in that meek whisper which is nearest silence; for I wanted to get close to him again.

"I have reason to fear," said he, "that those who, like Hagnon's son, are wise in this wisdom of killing, will some day decide that I too ought to be killed, and will thereupon issue instructions to the Eleven to do what is needful for putting to silence a troublesome tongue. And the Eleven will proceed in the usual manner."

"That would be dreadful, Socrates," I cried, almost sobbing. "You shall not say it—" and I laid my hand across his lips. "But you are not in earnest, Socrates; you are laughing. And you know what I meant. It is only people like the Syrian that ought to be killed." And in this I did not yield, not even to him, but kept saying it over and over in my heart, that the Syrian ought to be killed.

At length, as we passed through the darkness of the narrow lanes, with only a streak of black sky sprinkled with stars above us, I again opened my lips.

"The gods kill people," I said.

"Do you know that the gods kill people, little sophist? or do you just say it, not knowing at all?"

"I am not a sophist," I answered, thinking of the Syracusan. "But they sent the plague."

"Do you really know that they sent the plague? If you should thrust your hand among the red coals, would you say that the gods had burned you?" I was silent. "I think it would be more just," said he, "to say that Themistocles sent the plague, for if we had not had so many ships the plague would not have come to us; or Pericles, for if the city had not been so crowded with people by the war it would not have brought such desolation. But if the gods do kill, they at least make no mistakes."

"But they do make mistakes," I cried. "They let my mother die, when they ought to have saved her. And we all prayed so hard; and she was good."

"Some might say," he began—but stopped. "I, at least, will not say it,—for I do not think that it is true. I believe in my soul that your mother was all that you think her—as sweet and as beauful, almost, as the goddesses who dwell in heaven, and far better than some that the poets sing of. And this question, why the gods permit these things, is the hardest that any ever asked me, or can ask."

"They are cruel." And I spoke with a sense of triumph even in my grief.

"They are wise. Can you not trust something to the gods? We cannot know all their wisdom; though afterwards—yet not always—we may see that what they did was best. You wished to sail to Thrace. Athena did not permit you. She was the wiser."

"That is different," I said.

He began again: "Did your mother, in her very love for you, never take anything from you that you wanted?"

"Yes: she took the spiced wine once from my very lips; and I was angry."

"And did she never refuse you anything when you begged her for it?"

"Yes: she would not let me go out through the door; and I begged her many times and cried. She was just like Athena, wasn't she?"

"But afterward you knew that she was good to you; and you would believe it now, even if you could not quite understand. And just so when the gods take from us what we very much want, and refuse what we pray for though we fall on our faces before them, we often weep bitterly and grow angry, and think that they are cruel and that we know better than they. And all the while they know best; and they are caring for you more tenderly, if that be possible, than your own mother. And but now they have delivered you out of the hands of the Syrian, which your own mother could hardly have done; for, after all, she could not be quite so wise and good, and not nearly so strong, as the immortal gods. Can you not trust them? for it is only thus that we can be truly wise when other wisdom fails us. Can you not trust them—even when you do not understand—just as you trusted her? O little one, it is hard; it is very hard, sometimes, and almost more than we can bear,—but can you not remember to trust them always?"

"I will try to, Socrates," I said, choking. And still, beneath it all, that same thought was droning in the bottom of my heart—the Syrian ought to be killed.

* * * * * * * * * * * *

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS

At the meetings of the United Lodge of Theosophists a part of the time is devoted to Question and Answer. The questions and answers that follow were taken stenographically while "The Ocean of Theosophy," by Wm. Q. Judge, was being studied.

It should be remembered that while the answers are given from the standpoint of many years' experience and application, they are not to be taken as hard and fast definitions, nor as authoritative; but may be used as explanations and applications of the philosophy of Theosophy as related to the particular phases presented in the various questions. Each student, being "the final authority" for himself, should not accept any statement by any being whatever unless he himself perceives its truth.

Beginning with Chapter I of the "Ocean," the succeeding chapters will be taken up seriatim.

CHAPTER IX.

(*Continued.*)

Q. Then the after-death states would be the building-in of the experiences gained?

A. It should be understood that the after-death states of Kama-Loka and Devachan are *wholly personal* in their nature. The sloughing off of the purely terrestrial desires and passions is Kama-Loka; the assimilation and enjoyment of all that was best in the life last lived, is the Devachanic condition. Both states are Subjective, that is—the being in both states is occupied with *his own* thoughts, desires and feelings; is not aware of the presence of other beings, nor in contact with them. The world he lives in, is peopled by his own creations, which are as real to him as were the physical beings he moved among during his bodily existence. Having had his varied experience in the physical world, he leaves the body which served him as the means of contact with physical beings and lives in the desires, feelings and thoughts which his contact with the physical plane had engendered. At death—of which the being is not aware, being still his conscious *thinking self*—the thoughts prevailing are those that sprung from his relations with others in bodies and necessarily relate to his desires—this is Kama-Loka, the place or state of Desire. As his purely physical desires are not reinforced or stimulated by contact with other beings, they gradually die out, and his higher ideals and attributes remain as the basis for the Devachanic state, a state where no thought of sin, sorrow, suffering or death can enter, or even that such things exist. In both states he feels himself to be *the same person*, obtains his compensation for the sorrows of life in Devachan and assimilates in that state the best of his life last lived, adding the result to his inner egoic nature. Then a new birth based upon the unexpended causes generated during previous lives.

Q. What is meant by "unexpended causes"?

A. If—as is shown—we have lived many lives and have affected other incarnated beings in a way that requires adjustment by us, and the co-ordination of our lives heretofore has not been such as to bring us in contact so as to make that adjustment possible, these unexpended causes will have to be met as effects in some life and either adjusted, or strengthened as further causes. We may be meeting in this life the effects of causes set in motion many lives back as well as those of a more recent causation. As we think over the contacts with others in this present life, we will find some that were friendly for a time, and others that were inimical, but both of which are but memories now, our external connections with those persons having ceased. These friends or enemies of ours are still what we made them, and although the feelings then engendered have no present means of manifestation, nevertheless they remain as unexpended *causes* in our nature, and in the natures of those friends or enemies, the effects of which will be experienced when we meet again in this or future lives. The lapse of time does not change the power or nature of the cause. We should therefore make friends for the future as Jesus advised in saying, "Forgive your enemies; do good to them that despitefully use you and persecute you".

Q. It would seem then that we are bound by an endless chain of cause and effect to earth-life?

A. It would be, and is an "endless chain" if we persist in setting causes in motion that bind us to rebirth; but this we need not do, and would not, if we knew our real nature. It is to point the way to freedom from rebirth that Theosophy was given to us, to relieve us from the dire necessity which the operation of the Law of Karma in ourselves compels us to undergo. The Gita says "Freedom comes from *a renunciation of self-interest* in the fruits of our actions". Not that we should desire to escape, but that we should so think and act as to bring about the purposes of Soul. This we can do when we know and realize our real nature and act in accordance with It, for in It lies the source of all power, and with It the freedom of choice.

Q. Then a Master who occupied a body for the benefit of Humanity would not pass through the Kama-Lokic and Devachanic states after the death of the body?

No. He would *occupy* the body without being attached to it. He would be living a conscious existence in Spirit, while being "in all things like unto us" as far as appearances go. He would know how to balance Cause and Effect in all that He did, having no attachment to either and acting only for the good of all. Operating through a body with full knowledge, He would have no illusions and therefore no personal subjective states like Kama-Loka or Devachan, and on leaving the body, would exist in His own true nature as He had been existing all the time. As an ancient saying is: "He loves, and He understands", and He serves Humanity as best He can.

Q. In returning to birth does the Ego have to pass through the same experiences in Kama-Loka that he passed through after the death of the body?

A. He does not pass through the same experiences for they were those of that personal life, and in re-birth a new combination of the Ego's past lives, consisting of such unexpended causes as the particular period of re-birth permits, make up the new personality. The Ego, however, finds awaiting him those Kamic tendencies which he had not overcome; at the same time he will be strengthened by his Devachanic assimilation.

Q. An Ego who had exhausted his Devachanic experiences and required re-birth but found nothing that suited his requirements would be in a miserable state would he not?

A. We must remember the nature of the Ego. He is not any of his personalities; they make up *the field* of his earthly experiences. When the best effects of the life last lived are exhausted in Devachan and the sum of them added to all past experiences of the Ego, be they great or small, all personal illusions have vanished. He exists as Ego, and—to use a phrase—reviews the past and sees what must follow under Karma. Our conceptions of time have no effect upon the Ego; karmic conditions alone move him; when these are ready he sinks into re-birth in that race, period and family that will give him the requisite environment according to his individual karma.

Q. The lines at the top of page 74, that the divergencies from physical heredity are vastly greater than the transmitted traits, would indicate that physical heredity is not a law?

A. Physical heredity is a *process* by which the Law is fulfilled. There is necessarily a karmic connection between the ego entering birth and the parents and family into which he comes. The parents furnish the embodiment with those tendencies that best meet the incoming ego's requirements for that life. There are Three lines of evolution, the Spiritual, the Manasic or Intellectual, and the Physical, and these three are intermixed and interblended at every point.

Q. Please explain Spiritual Heredity?

A. According to the Secret Doctrine there are Seven great hierarchies of spiritual beings; every human being is a descent from one or another of those Seven great classes of being. This question however requires special study before any attempt at a comprehensible reply could be made; the Secret Doctrine will give all the information available.

Q. The earth is such a small planet in the vast assemblage of planets, would that not indicate that people incarnated here from other planets?

A. Not if we understand the workings of Karma. We are connected spiritually, intellectually, astrally and physically with the beings which constitute the evolutionary stream of this earth, and can no more separate ourselves from them than we can separate our

physical heart from our head and exist as physical beings. We are karmically indebted to all the kingdoms connected with the earth for every vehicle of consciousness that we possess; our minds also are colored and limited by the mind of the race to which we belong. The same is true of the humanities of other planets; they must reap where they have sown, they cannot reap where they have not sown. As we rise to Egoic consciousness, we will transcend all ideas of particular localities, and be sensible of varying conditions rather than places or planets.

Q. Well, after having reached all knowledge there would be no need of reincarnating?

A. Perhaps not in this race; perhaps not on this earth again; but all-knowledge is useless unless it is used; all-knowledge implies the knowledge gained by all beings, it does not contain that which has not been gained. Progress is continuous in possibility and in an infinite universe there is no stopping place; to cease to progress is to stagnate. The ancient saying is that we can always approach the light, but we can never touch the flame, for that flame is our Self—the Self of All.

Q. Can one tell whether a soul is progressing by any one incarnation?

A. One can realize for himself his own ignorance and quickly or slowly gain real knowledge. He may realize what past lives must have been from the nature and strength of the difficulties he encounters in the struggle. It is enough if he sees the real goal and ever struggles towards it, and it will be well for him if he thinks not at all of his own progress but of what he can do to help others progress. "To live to benefit mankind is the first step."

Q. In the chapter it says that people are incarnated together who have been together in other incarnations. Would that necessarily be continuous?

A. We must remember that what we call "people" are Souls that we have met in bodies before, and in bodies have karmically connected ourselves with them for good or for evil. The bodily connection is brought about by the mutual karmic connection and from wise or foolish choice. The continuity of such relations depends upon our desires, but we cannot control the desires of those who do not want what we do. As long as we hold to "likes and dislikes" as our basis, we will meet with those who occasioned them, while the latter in their turn may have changed from "like" to "dislike" or the reverse. We can "come out from among them" by not permitting *our* likes or dislikes to govern us, while being friendly and helpful to all. "The wise man seeks that which is homogeneous with his own nature."

Q. Since we are in our present form as Humanity for eighteen million years, it would seem that if there were no wars there would be no room for all of us?

A. Let us take another view of the question; if the earth has lasted for eighteen millions of years and there is no record of its

being overcrowded at any time, why should we fear any such condition? It has been stated that while the number of reincarnating egos connected with the earth is very great, the number is limited in fact, there having been no increase of egos since the middle point of the seven rounds. Further, as those egos had no small part in the formation of the earth, there can be no doubt that it will accommodate in their proper periods all egos connected with it. The Law of Compensation or Karma adjusts all things to the need of the beings in manifestation. And while we are considering the question let us not forget that our earth is in reality composed of six degrees of substance besides that which we perceive through our physical senses—the lowest of all.

Q. It is said that by living according to the dictates of the Soul, the brain may be made porous. Can that be explained?

A. It has been often stated that the body and brain are formed from the food, the brain being more plastic than any other organ of the body. Naturally the characteristics of our brain will be in accordance with our modes of thought and feeling. If our ways of thinking are purely personal, selfish and physical, the brain will only respond to such impressions; but by thinking on high ideals and acting in accordance with them, the brain will gradually become impressionable by them. When the change has been brought about, the brain will record all that goes on during sleep of the body, and we will be in touch with all our past existences and our whole inner nature. The "high ideals" spoken of are not the so-called high ideals of mankind which are based upon physical existence, but those which the Secret Doctrine shows to be concerned with the real Spiritual nature, its laws, and the real meaning of Evolution on all planes.

ERRATUM IN "AFTER DEATH STATES" IV

In the above named article, appearing in April THEOSOPHY, the last sentence on page 176 was printed: For though we call the less fine stages of substance by the name "matter", it is, however, made up of lives which have in them the potentiality of becoming Souls in the enormously distant future; and the Soul being itself a life made up of smaller ones, it is under the brotherly necessity of waiting in the bonds of matter long enough to give the latter the right impetus along the path of perfection.

The last part of this sentence, beginning with the phrase, "and the Soul", etc., was intended to read as follows: and the Soul, being of its own nature, and not itself a life made of smaller ones, though using these as its field of experience, is under the brotherly necessity of waiting in the bonds of "matter" long enough to give the latter the right impetus along the path of perfection.

QUERIES AND ANSWERS*

DREAMLAND. By C. D. S.

IN the year 1887 I became acquainted through correspondence with a Dr. G——, of H—— C——, a physician, and clairvoyant. Our acquaintance soon ripened into more than friendship, we became brothers in heart and spirit, the affinity which existed between us was intense, we felt a longing desire to see each other. I invited the Dr. to visit me at Weston-super-Mare, which invitation he accepted, continuing our almost daily correspondence in the meanwhile. On the 4th August, 1887, my thoughts were so intense all day about Dr. G——, that on retiring to rest about 10:30 p.m., I soon fell asleep while thinking of him. Willing to myself a determination, if possible, to obtain a description of his person, my will power succeeded, for on the following morning I was enabled to write to Dr. G—— as follows: "Dear Frater G——,—Last evening while asleep, I had a vision, and saw you most distinctly (spiritually); you appeared to me to be a person about 5ft. 6in. in height, 11 stone in weight, long oval face with gray hair and beard, and sitting in your bedroom in a large armchair covered with black leather cloth; you had divested yourself of your coat and sat at a table, your arm resting thereon supporting your face, and apparently asleep from over-exertion. My spiritual form on floating into your room, became horizontal with your face, and I kissed your forehead; the touch instantly broke the spiritual affinity, and I awoke from sleep. Can you describe the cause of this most extraordinary vision? . . . " On the 10th August, 1887, the Dr. wrote me as follows: "Dear Friend,—Yours to hand, the description of my person is very accurate. I am 5ft. 6½in. high, 10½ stone weight, long oval face, going gray rapidly, this in the hair; while thinking deeply I sit as you say; I have no doubt you saw me, I felt languid next day, so I must have been away from my body; I have undertaken the cure of a gentleman at Nunhead, London, of Bright's disease and in diagnosing the condition of his kidneys my attitude would be such as you describe, I was looking at him from my bedroom, and sitting in a large cushioned easy chair at the time 11 p.m., I was also thinking of you, and fell into a profound sleep while doing so, etc., etc., etc., ... " I immediately wrote to Dr. G——, asking again for his explanation of this most extraordinary sympathetic vision. On the 15th August, 1887, I received his reply, wherein he said: "In answering your question, I must say that I forgot in my last letter to explain how you were brought here. H——s, my spiritual friend and adviser, saw there was great affinity between thee and me, he also saw your desire to get a glimpse of me, and as you did not possess the gift of clairvoyance (like

* This article was first printed by H. P. Blavatsky in *Lucifer* for September, 1890.

myself) he had no other alternative but to bring you here. The *modus operandi* is as follows: If *they* wish to bring you bodily, *they* deprive you of consciousness, *they* then de-materialise your physical body, and reduce it to gaseous atoms, *they* then leave intact the attachment between the soul and de-materialised atoms, the latter follow the soul in its flight to where it is wanted, and by a magnetic pass the physical body is again restored to its natural conditions. But if *they* merely bring the soul (in sleep it is free of the body save the umbilical cord) the umbilical cord must be attached to the body and becomes attenuated according to distance. If the spiritual cord uniting the physical and spiritual bodies gets severed, the soul cannot again return to its tenement, and physical death is the result. The last mode is the one practised upon you . . . *Au revoir; croyez tout à mon cœur.*

"Faithfully yours,

"E. G——."

Letter from the Dreamer to W. W. Westcott.

Care Frater,

I do not think my seer-friend's theory of my vision the right one; let me give my adeptship's description of it. The vision might be active with the light of this world, but his explanation of my clairvoyant journey is *far* from the truth; there is no need for de-materialization whatever, even in the case of one not clairvoyant naturally. The Dr. says that I was abstracted from the physical body and by the attenuation of the umbilical cord (or what corresponds to it in the spiritual body) I was carried into his presence and *saw him.* Now if *I saw him* at all it was by the spiritual eye, and this being so, I should not see his material body, but would see his *spiritual body,* which I cannot think was in the arm-chair, but was occupied elsewhere, just as mine is now in talking to you and trying to explain these things, as if I saw you face to face regardless of *where I am* until the moment when my spirit *returns again. Note this,* the spiritual body does not correspond to the natural, which is born of connubium of fathers and mothers, but is in size and form and quality according to the degree of power attained by experience of wisdom and love in Heaven, and of truth and charity on Earth. I would therefore be unable to describe my *best* friend in the spirit-form unless simultaneously we were both in *the spirit;* but on coming back into the natural world I would instantly forget that form and remember his natural form. When I sleep I forget the forms of the world and see new forms, recognizing them as persons then in the flesh; but on waking I retain only the impression of having seen them, but do not remember them otherwise than in the natural or fleshly form; the reason is, that the spiritual life is the natural death, and the natural death the spiritual life; then the memory of one closes as that of the other opens. This is true as to *forms only;* principles remain the same, thus I may be a good man on earth, and the same principles would follow me, because they are motives or

affections from which *I live* and which *make me what I am;* my form here might be crippled or distorted, but it would not be otherwise than beautiful in the world of spirits, and in the celestial world more beautiful still and more powerful and greater in stature. I will now sum up in a few words. In my case (vision) I consider my spiritual eyes were partially opened, and that the brain became impressed *by thought* sufficiently to remember the form conveyed. I did not see; it was spiritual attendants who saw the Doctor's spirit and projected the image upon my brain *through my mind,* and upon rewaking I received a corresponding physical impression. The spirits do not see the material body as we see it, but *they* see the spiritual body and can only receive the material form by reading it off the *memory* of the man; but then it is only an *imagination* or *thought* with them, and not a reality as with us; the spiritual body is the one *they* see and feel and act upon.

I trust my remarks in attempting to reason the matter will let you consider the subject yourself, then I would feel greatly obliged by your candid opinion as to which theory may seem to you the most reasonable, viz: the Doctor's or mine.

Your frater in the Spirit of Truth,

Chabrath-zereh-aur-boker.

25/6/90.

ED. NOTE.—According to Theosophical teachings, though the theory of the "dreamer" is far more philosophical than that of the "Seer"—yet, the latter is, also, philosophically incorrect. It seems rather disrespectful to contradict "a spiritual friend and adviser" of whatever description, but if the said personage insists upon his extraordinary *modus operandi*—then we are compelled to reiterate our old and never varying charge, namely that "Spirits" knowing rarely, if ever, what they are talking about, wool-gather most of the time. And little wonder if the "Dreamer" (passionate affinity notwithstanding) refuses point blank to accept his "affinity's" fantastic explanation. Let us analyze the latter: Spirits first deprive one of one's consciousness, then *they* dematerialize one's physical body (?!); after which they reduce it "to gaseous atoms," leaving intact only the attachment (?) between the Soul and said atoms—like the *grin* between Alice and her Cheshire cat. But the atoms, we are told, follow the soul in its aërial flight, to be found ready at a magnetic pass (by whom?) to be once more *rematerialized*, &c., &c. This theory reminds one of the old Spiritualistic claim that a medium's body *may be disintegrated* by the Spirits and carried by them through walls to any distance, and rematerialized as easily. Mrs. Marshall, we are asked to believe, was so disintegrated, and carried three miles off from her bedroom and *re-built* and dropped on a table of a dark *séance* room. Occultism, however, denies such possibility. It teaches that no living creature, man or mosquito, can be so disintegrated and live. This may be done with flowers and

minerals, plants and other things which may be made to pass through "solid" roofs and walls; but no living man or being can be dealt with in such fashion without death ensuing. This is what Occultism, backed by logic and common sense, teaches us, for it admits no such thing as a supernatural miracle. Nor has the "umbilical cord" anything to do with "Soul," *but only with the astral body* (the "Double") whenever the latter is projected outside the body.

The explanation of the "Dreamer" is far more near to the teachings of Occultism, although the statement that it was not *himself* who saw but that the image upon his brain and *through his mind* was projected by "spiritual attendants" seems a new phrase which sounds very vague and unsatisfactory. The image of his friend, the Seer, was of course projected upon his brain and *through* his mind; but as the latter was his *lower* physical mind (*Kama-manas*) so the "projector" was his higher, or Spiritual mind (*Manas* proper). There is no need, indeed, of any "Spiritual attendant," man having always in him his own attendant, the reincarnating Higher *Ego*. Notwithstanding the pitying fling at him by his friend, the "Seer," who denies him any clairvoyance, the "Dreamer" must undeniably be a clairvoyant, to have seen, as he did, so vividly and so correctly, his "Frater G." The vision is very easily explained. He fell asleep thinking of his friend whom he had never seen in body, *willing* to see him, and thus passing immediately from the waking to the dreaming state. What wonder then, that his will stirred to powerful action by strong desire, his *human* mind (the lower Manas) being paralyzed, moreover, by the sudden sleep of the body, acted through the divine and omniscient "Seer" instead of doing so through his uncertain, human principle of thought, which confuses and throws into confusion all it sees in sleep, upon awakening? "Kshetragna" (our Higher Ego), says Indian philosophy, is the embodied Spirit, that which knows all and informs at times our *Kshetra* (the mortal body). The case of the "Dreamer" was one of such special cases. He saw *through* and *with* the spiritual, all-seeing eye of his divine Ego. Impressing the sight upon its human sleeping, and therefore plastic and passive mind and memory, the latter remembered what the Ego had seen upon awakening. This is quite natural and no *miracle* is involved.

SECRET DOCTRINE TEACHINGS*

Esoteric philosophy teaches that everything lives and is conscious, but not that all life and consciousness are similar to those of human or even animal beings. Life we look upon as "the one form of existence," manifesting in what is called matter; or, as in man, what, incorrectly separating them, we name Spirit, Soul and Matter.

* From the Original Edition, Vol. I, p. 49; see Vol. I, pp. 79-80, Third Edition.

METEMPSYCHOSIS

THE meaning behind this ancient and honorable word has, like many another, been pulled down and degraded by popular misconception till it represents anything but what it was originally intended to convey. Recognizing this, H. P. Blavatsky, in the section of *Isis Unveiled* entitled "Before the Veil" says:

> "To avoid confusion that might easily arise by the frequent employment of certain terms in a sense different from that familiar to the reader, a few explanations will be timely. We desire to leave no pretext either for misunderstanding or misrepresentation. Magic may have one signification to one class of readers and another to another class. We shall give it the meaning it has in the minds of its Oriental students and practitioners. And so with the words *Hermetic Science, Occultism, Hierophant, Adept, Sorcerer,* etc.; there has been little agreement of late as to their meaning. Though the distinctions between the terms are very often insignificant—merely ethnic—still, it may be useful to the general reader to know just what that is. We give a few alphabetically." (i, xxii)

Among the words thus given is *metempsychosis,* which she defines as follows:

> "The progress of the soul from one stage of existence to another. Symbolized and vulgarly believed to be rebirths in animal bodies. *A term generally misunderstood by every class of European and American society, including many scientists.* The kabalistic axiom, 'A stone becomes a plant, a plant an animal, an animal a man, a man a spirit, and a spirit a god,' receives an explanation in Manu's *Manava-Dharma-Sastra,* and other Brahmanical books." (i, xxxvi-xxxvii)

On pages 8 and 9 of chapter I of the first volume of *Isis,* she makes some highly significant statements. Thus:

> "The doctrine of *Metempsychosis* has been abundantly ridiculed by men of science and rejected by theologians, yet *if it had been properly understood in its application to the indestructibility of matter and the immortality of spirit, it would have been perceived that it is a sublime conception.* Should we not first regard the subject from the stand-point of the ancients before venturing to disparage its teachers.
>
> . . .
>
> *If the Pythagorean metempsychosis should be thoroughly explained and compared with the modern theory of evolution, it would be found to supply every 'missing link' in the chain of the latter."*

All through the two volumes of *Isis* she recurs again and again to this subject of metempsychosis and is constantly giving out hints as to its basis, real meaning, implications and applications. The celebrated passages on pages 346-351 of volume I which later led Mr. C. C. Massey to accuse H. P. B. of supporting at different times different theories as to reincarnation, and which Col. H. S. Olcott refers to in support of his claim that at the time of the writing of *Isis* H. P. B. neither knew of nor believed in reincarnation—these and similar passages are easily understood by one who knows the facts, (a) of the true teachings of metempsychosis; (b) of the collateral circumstances. Page 346 is clearly a misprint as shown on its face by the contradictions of the two paragraphs. Furthermore these typographical and other errors in *Isis* were pointed out by H. P. B. in an article by her in *The Path* for November, 1886, entitled "Theories About Reincarnation and Spirits."* And in her last article, "My Books,"† published in *Lucifer* for May, 1891, she shows that she herself was in no way responsible for these mistakes of proof-reading and typography—a fact subsequently admitted by Col. Olcott, who attended to everything except the writing of the manuscript. But he never admitted any mistakes of his own, though himself confessedly ignorant of the various subjects treated. Thus he says that not only did he himself know nothing of reincarnation at the time *Isis* was being written—1874-1877—but that neither H. P. B. nor the Master himself who visited him knew of the subject at that time! Yet he himself gives the lie to his own statements for he says (*Old Diary Leaves*, I, 237) that a Master taught him the *Law of Karma* almost from the beginning, and certainly prior to June 22, 1875, the date he gives to the letter from which he quotes. And how could any one teach the Law of Karma without at the same time teaching metempsychosis and reincarnation? How, in fact, could there be any Law of Karma at all without metempsychosis?

And the passage on page 351 at once puts the reader on guard as to its nature by saying, "We will now present *a few fragments* of this mysterious doctrine of reincarnation—*as distinct from metempsychosis*—which we have from an authority"—meaning, of course her Masters. She goes on, "Reincarnation, *i. e.*, the appearance of the same individual, or rather of his *astral monad*, twice on the same planet, is not a *rule* in nature; it is an exception, like the teratological phenomenon of a two-headed infant." This is the passage that excited Mr. C. C. Massey and many others besides himself and Col. Olcott, yet it is clear enough in all conscience. It refers to the only kind of reincarnation then believed in at all by any one in Europe and America—the kind of reincarnation taught by Allan Kardec and his school of spiritists. They taught that it was the same *personality* which reincarnates again and again, whereas the reincarnation of the same personality is an abnormality in

*Reprinted in THEOSOPHY, April, 1914.
†Reprinted in THEOSOPHY, June, 1914.

nature and occurs only under rare conditions. This is and always has been the occult doctrine, but as neither Mr. Massey nor Col. Olcott knew anything about the secret doctrine on this obscure subject they jumped to their own false conclusions and were of course sure that "poor old H. P. B. was mistaken," and as ignorant or more ignorant than themselves.

But to return from this necessary digression. It is certain that H. P. B. gave out much in *Isis* that has been overlooked or altogether misread by students, not only in regard to metempsychosis but also in connection with many other things. She knew that the time was not ripe to present too much to a public that would be more than enough astounded, more than enough incredulous—as the event proved. Nevertheless, *Isis* contains hints on many things that she never again repeated; hints given with a purpose just as exact as her purpose where she spoke clearly. For it is not hard to see that in a book circulated indiscriminately what was one man's meat might be another man's poison. She had not only to gain an audience for what she had to teach; she had to give lines of direction to those who might be attracted to the investigation of what is now generally called "practical occultism"—what to follow and what to avoid. And we may believe she had a more recondite purpose still—to arouse the intuitions of those who had studied and practiced Occultism long ago in other lives, but who had gone astray into false paths; those who in this life are struggling in the bonds of matter to reconquer their footing on the field of battle and regain the knowledge which was theirs in former births. Her hints are for them.

From this point of view—that of the "*progress of the soul* from one stage of existence to another"—a *reminiscence* of the missing links of their evolution would be the spark that was needed for those "who were ready." It is an illustration of that "power of the Word" to which *Isis* contains so many allusions. Take a single sentence from those quoted: "The application of the doctrine of metempsychosis to the indestructibility of matter and the immortality of spirit." Here is something for the inner man to dwell on. It is indeed a "sublime conception" if dwelt upon. "Sublime" means lofty, elevated, noble, *spiritual*. "Conception" means gestation physical, mental, moral or spiritual—the germinal point from which birth becomes possible. In this one sentence then, if brooded upon, is the beginning of *spiritual rebirth*—metempsychosis itself. For the individual soul to persist, immortal spirit must be clothed in indestructible matter. We are immortal spirit clothed in mortal garments—body, mind and moral nature composed of discordant elements. The lower elements are so because of the use to which we put them. But when the incarnate soul succeeds in merging his thought, will and feeling with the Divine Spirit "the mortal becomes immortal," the final *metempsychosis* is accomplished, the progress of the soul is achieved, and immortality a realized fact—*Isis* is *Unveiled*.

ON THE LOOKOUT

In the *Saturday Evening Post* of April 12, Alfred Noyes writes a powerful article on present day conditions and their import under the title "Civilization Imperiled." He goes to the root of the destructive agencies at work in these words:

> "The greater part of the world has lost its religious sense, lost its sense of the ties which bind men to one another and to the Eternal in an interdependent harmony. . . . In the art and literature of the day we can see for ourselves all those destructive forces actually at work attacking all the higher standards on behalf of a leagued mediocrity, and carrying the world with them on a wave of loose sexual suggestion. . . . On the surface, in the English speaking countries, things are going on very much as usual; but under the surface there has been a change of tremendous and terrible import. The surface is only a very thin skin, and underneath there is a wild intellectual and moral chaos unprecedented in the history of the world, except perhaps in the moral chaos that preceded the fall of Rome."

We agree with Mr. Noyes in the facts he relates, and also in his conclusion that "we are living in such a decadent time that nothing but a re-establishment of a true sense of right and wrong can prevent our civilization from going to pieces." But when he presents an amalgamation of the churches as the only means, or even as proper and fitting agents to that end, we contend that he is desirous of committing the remedy into the hands of those who uphold the very dogmas, creeds and superstitions that have driven humanity into recklessness, despair and misery, and forced so very many into the ranks of agnosticism and materialism. For twenty centuries the Christian churches have endeavored to enslave the minds of men with creeds and dogmas, and their history is full of accounts of oppression, torture and death inflicted on those who dared to differ from or oppose their edicts. The same creeds and dogmas are held by the churches today, and were it not for the freedom of thought forced from them by the people at large, there is no reason to doubt that the same intolerance would be shown today. Less than one-third of the people of the United States are today even nominal members of the 170-odd Christian sects, and the proportion grows smaller with each passing year. Why is this? It can only be the "depravity" of the race, or that the churches have given them stones in place of bread. In either case the churches have failed — abjectly and miserably — of their supposed mission.

Creeds — that is, "beliefs" — are not what mankind needs; it needs Knowledge — *self-evident* truths; and nothing else will either serve it or save it. For, granted the efficacy of "belief" in any case or of any kind, any contrary "belief" cannot be refused the same consideration. Herein lies the weak point of Christianity; its calls for "belief" have spread the idea that one's belief in any religion or philosophy is a good and sufficient reason for holding it and maintaining it, and condemning all other beliefs. Is it any wonder that hundreds of Christian sects have sprung up, with more to come? Is it any wonder that non-belief exists so widely as a protest against warring sects and beliefs? There is a writing acknowledged by Christians that "no man putteth new wine in old bottles, lest the bottles burst and the wine be lost." It is "new wine" that the people need. They know the "old bottles" and will have none of them, no matter how many there may be in one aggregation. The churches are blind leaders of the blind and by their very constitution are incapable of performing the miracle that Mr. Noyes hopes for. The ethics and moralities found in both the old and the new testaments are not peculiar to those books, but are to be found in the

sacred writings of all peoples and all times. They are not dependent upon any belief whatever, nor any *form* of religion, "revealed" or otherwise. They are inherent in the spiritual nature of Man himself and are recognized and brought into action by each human being for himself to the extent that he recognizes that spiritual nature.

Mr. Noyes says that "The Law is our only pathway through chaos," but the word Law must be understood to be Universal Law, inerrant and invariable, and not the dictum of any imaginary being. It is expressed in the New Testament in the words "*whatsoever* a man soweth, *that* shall he also reap." The converse is equally true that *whatever* he is reaping, he must have sown. Universal Law is thus shown to rest in and proceed from the individual, there being no action unless there is a being to act or feel its effects. As a civilization we are now experiencing the exact effects of our wrong conceptions of Deity and of Law; of the nature and purpose of human existence. These wrong and destructive conceptions innumerable in their ramifications have been imposed upon the minds of men by the churches which pretend to hold and promulgate the last word, while at the same time admitting their ignorance of the mysteries that surround us on every hand. The part of wisdom of every real thinker; of men whose humanitarian disposition cannot be doubted; of men of close observation and high intelligence who have the means of reaching the public mind, is to cast aside all preconceptions and prejudices and seek for Truth wherever it may be found; to go beyond all forms of religion whose limitations are so apparent, and find what has always existed and awaited recognition—a Knowledge of the laws that govern all the constituents of nature and of man. And let such seekers after truth look for it, not at the hands of would-be exponents however publicly accepted, but at the Source itself, a source which is easily found by those who really seek. It is this that Humanity needs, and this alone that can save it. "THERE IS NO RELIGION HIGHER THAN TRUTH."

The Reverend Holden E. Sampson is the author of a number of books with quite ambitious titles such as "Progressive Creation", "Progressive Redemption", "The Message of the Sun", "The True Mystic", "Theo-Sophia", "Scientific Mysticism", "The Scala", "The Bhagavad-Gita Interpreted", and no doubt others. One might readily assume that the author is possessed of more than ordinary understanding of the subjects whereof he treats, especially as he has announced himself as an "Initiate" of "fifty-seven degrees", a number which is not particularly occult, but one which will have a familiar sound to most readers. It should be hardly necessary to say that anyone who claims to be an "Initiate", by that very fact presents the evidence that he is neither an Initiate nor even a disciple. That he is commercializing his lucubrations on the strength of his claims is very patent; that however is his own affair, and we are interested only in giving to our readers a sample of his knowledge and understanding in a quotation from an article written by him and published in the magazine "Azoth" for April entitled "The Idea of Karma". Comment is unnecessary.

> "The *'Purpose'* of every man's Karma is Pre-ordained and Predetermined throughout the ages of Time . . . every person has been born in the Predestination of GOD. . . . The LAW OF KARMA has nothing whatever to do with the ordering of a person's circumstances, his conditions, nor his earthly environment; nor, in most cases of re-birth, has it a hand in the hereditary or parental conditions of re-birth. . . . The mass of men reincarnate from the Astral Plane. . . . The Demons have taken the Rulership of this world—Astral and Material—out of the hands of the LORDS OF KARMA. . . . The truth is that not one in tens of thousands is born with the remotest connection with, or relation to, the LAW OF KARMA."

In this "transition age" we may expect to be poured forth in the whirlpool every variety of personal psychological experiences. These range all the way from expositions of "cosmic consciousness" to the most bizarre examples of moral and mental degeneracy. All of them find followers who take them seriously and accept the "revelations" offered. We have Christian Mysticism, Christian Science, Rosicrucianism, saintship, seership, devil-worship, necromancy, whatnot—ghosts of the past which once more essay to "walk the earth." They are the scum which comes to the surface in the melting-pot of the times, and are, in one sense, the premonitory symptoms of "that faculty of perception which is growing in man" of which *Isis Unveiled* speaks. They are the inchoate and disordered manifestation and exercise of that "sixth sense" which in the Secret Doctrine was tentatively named *normal* clairvoyance when naturally developed by orderly evolution. There is periodically a resurgence of "clairvoyance" in the race, but as generally manifested it is at best a form of mediumship and at worst a variety of demonical possession. Its "revelations" vary according to the mental and moral nature of the medium. The recent *Life* of Emmanuel Swedenborg by George Trobridge will doubtless draw attention to the subject as well as to the nature and teachings of the great Swedish clairvoyant.

H. P. B. says of Swedenborg in *The Theosophical Glossary:*

"He was born on the 29th January, 1688, and was the son of Dr. Jasper Swedberg, bishop of Skara, in West Gothland; and died in London, in Great Bath Street, Clerkenwell, on March 29th, 1772. Of all mystics, Swedenborg has certainly influenced 'Theosophy' the most, yet he left a far more profound impress on official science. For while as an astronomer, mathematician, physiologist, naturalist, and philosopher he had no rival, in psychology and metaphysics he was certainly behind his time. When forty-six years of age he became a 'Theosophist', and a 'seer'; but, although his life had been at all times blameless and respectable, he was never a true philanthropist or an ascetic. His clairvoyant powers, however, were very remarkable; *but they did not go beyond this plane of matter;* all that he says of subjective worlds and spiritual beings is evidently far more the outcome of his exuberant fancy, than of his spiritual insight. He left behind him numerous works, which are sadly misinterpreted by his followers."

In the *Secret Doctrine*, Madame Blavatsky shows in numerous places the basic defects, whether of seers like Swedenborg, or of other speculators on after-death states and the conditions of life in other worlds. Volume I, original edition, pp. 117-118, she shows that the *fundamental* theories, both in the hypothesis of men of science and the "revelations" of modern seers, were anticipated and taught ages ago, and that it is mere conceit to claim them either as modern "discoveries" or as "revealed truths". Volume II, pp. 700-702, she says, speaking of the "other world" or worlds:

"All the so-called scientific fictions and spiritistic *revelations* from moon, stars, and planets (are) merely fresh combinations or modifications of the men and things, the passions and forms of life with which we are familiar, when even on the other planets of our own system *nature and life are entirely different from ours.* Swedenborg was pre-eminent in inculcating such an erroneous belief.

"But even more. The ordinary man has no experience of any state of consciousness other than that to which the physical senses link him. Men dream; they sleep the profound sleep which is too deep for dreams to impress the physical brain; *and in these states there must still be consciousness.* How, then, while these mysteries still remain unexplored, can *we* hope to speculate with profit on the nature of globes which, in the economy of nature, must needs belong to state of consciousness other and quite different from *any* which man experiences here?"

And she shows Swedenborg dressing the inhabitants of Mercury, whom he meets in the spirit-world, in clothes such as were worn in Europe in his time; the inhabitants of "the first earth of the astral world" clothed as European peasants then were, and on the "fourth earth" women clad as are the shepherdesses in a *bal masqué!* And it is fairly generally known that Swedenborg's heavenly guides and angels instructed him that in the world of spirit as in the world of flesh sex persists, and the marriage relation continues.

There is, *essentially,* no difference between the basis, and therefore the basic defects, of the revelations of Swedenborg, those of Andrew Jackson Davis, of the saints of the Catholic Church, the religious visionaries and ecstatics of other faiths, and the numberless communications from the seance room. The same is true of the "sympneumatics" of Thomas Lake Harris and his disciple Laurence Oliphant, of Dr. Anna Bonus Kingsford, the "Book of Mormon", and the phenomenal communications of what is called psychical research. We can include in the same category the variegated "messages from the Masters" with which "theosophical" literature of the last twenty-five years has been disfigured or embellished, according to the point of view. When we say "essentially," we refer to the source and nature of the communications. They differ greatly in their moral character and range of imaginary descriptions. That depends, as stated, on the moral character and mental characteristics of the medium and the participants. But they all spring from mediumship: the passive surrender to and control by subjective influences—exactly the same phenomenal status as insanity, somnambulism, hypnotism, and dreams. Mediumship and its kindred are essentially an emergence of dream-state of consciousness into the domain of waking consciousness, and represent an inversion of the natural order of evolution. Normal human consciousness is the complete dominance of the waking over the dream state. The two states are distinct, though related, and normal dream state is distinctly inferior to waking consciousness. Ages ago dream state was called "a province of waking state." When the two states are intermixed and both perceived, but not perceived separately, the *Ego is absolutely devoid of the means of discrimination,* for he has no basis of comparison. When the mergence is complete, the experiences of waking are subordinated to the *realities* of dream state.

What needs to be grasped by the student is that *both* waking and dream states are relative states and that neither can be fully understood until viewed from a higher and inclusive state—*Spiritual* Self-Consciousness. This would be the state of true normal clairvoyance of which H. P. B. speaks. Ordinary humanity is dominated by the experiences of waking state which are taken to be real. Mediums and men going to sleep are dominated by the experiences of dream state, which are taken to be real. At the time of transition from the one state into the other, neither is aware of the crossing. Neither recognizes that it is the Consciousness alone which is *real,* and so has no means of determining the transit from state to state, of separating and comparing the experiences of one state from and with those of another. Only the initiated chela or adept knows anything whatever of higher states of consciousness than waking and dreaming; and Adeptship is the exact opposite of mediumship. There are as many varieties of experience possible in dream state as in waking; more, in point of fact, and more illusive, because of the nature of the matter and beings proper to that state. The human being who enters dream state while still conscious in waking state is shipwrecked and swamped because he has lost his basis of relativities. He is in an unnatural and abnormal, not a supernatural and supernormal condition. The normal human being judges the universe, visible and invisible, from the basis of waking consicousness and its experiences. The medium judges all things from the basis of the dream state. Both err grievously,

and it is this false attribution of reality and inclusiveness to the experiences of either state, that is the barrier to spiritual knowledge—true Self-consciousness. But of the two states, the human being immersed in dream state is the one whose case is hopeless while the condition endures, because he has for the time being identified his consciousness with a lower, not a higher state than human waking consciousness. He is as lost to true comparison, logic and reason as is an insane man, a babe, or an animal. The waking man does not understand dream state, and knows nothing whatever of "deep sleep" states of consciousness. How, then, can any one overcome by dream state know anything of waking or any higher state than that? The waking man does not understand death; how then can the same man dead understand either living or after-death states, when he is in no way aware of the transition from one state to the other?

Professor Durant Drake of Vassar College writes in the *Harvard Theological Review* on the great spiritual ferment now going on. Of all the writers we have read he, more than any, approaches the subject with something like a catholicity of thought, a reverent sympathy for the soul that cries for bread. He notes that the vast theological output of the centuries concerning the God of cut and dried dogmas, is simply shelved in the minds of thinking men. He asks, "The question has become, not, Can we believe in the cut and dried conception of medieval and modern orthodoxy? but rather, Is there *any* conception of God that we can accept?" He answers his own question by saying, "the God-idea has become fluid again—the God of the future is in the making." He credits Matthew Arnold Emerson, James and others with having done much to bring about the present state of mind in the West. Professor Drake finds that there is much less atheism than a generation ago, but because no one need now be under the necessity to take refuge in atheism to escape orthodox christianity. "There are so many conceptions of God afloat," he says, "that any one at all widely read . . . can find one suited to his mental outlook and convictions." He sees everywhere, not so much denial of God as denial of the church ideas of God. Professor Drake "feels that the ejection of the 'orthodox' God leaves room for the preaching of the naturalistic God of contemporary thought." He would not be surprised to see such a conception "accepted by millions of spiritually famished men and women who have left forever the old dogmas." Professor Drake quotes many expressions of modern thinkers with evident sympathy. Some of them show an intuitional perception of Theosophical ideas. He quotes Emerson's "God! It's all God!" Carlyle accused of "pantheism" retorts—"Pantheism! Pantheism! What does it matter; it's religion." John Burroughs is made to say, "We must get rid of the great moral governor or head director. He is a fiction of our own brains. We must recognize only Nature, the All; call it God if we will, but divest it of all anthropological conceptions." President Eliot is added in the statement: "The Infinite Spirit pervades the universe, just as the spirit of a man pervades his body, and acts, consciously or unconsciously, in every atom of it." But Professor Drake sees anew the old "problem of evil." Without a personal God or a personal Devil how account for evil? Or what is the same thing, with an "infinite Spirit" how account for the diversity? These are familiar questions at every Theosophical meeting, and arise from imperfect perception of the "three fundamentals." The identity of man with the Supreme Spirit is vaguely grasped, but the miracle idea is still present; it is not seen that each being must of necessity pass through all experience to attain self-consciousness, and that Karma is inherent in all beings. Nevertheless, the whole tone of Professor Drake's article is not only sincere, it is undogmatic, reflective, searching, and must lead him and others who feel as he does, to something more than merely "wide-reading" in quest of something merely "suited to his (present) outlook and convictions." That is what is the matter with the dogmatist

and the bigot everywhere——he has *found* what suits his present ideas. What we all need to seek is some outlook that is horizonless and free; some "covenant" big enough to take in and to explain all things, differences as well as likenesses. We commend Professor Drake to a reading of the *Ocean of Theosophy* and of the *Bhagavad-Gita*. For there he will surely find that reconciliation of the science of fact and religion that alone can satisfy both the heart and the head.

From a recognition that this is a Universe of Law, it is, surely, a short step to the fact that reincarnation is necessary in the working of that Law. H. P. B. spoke of Karma and reincarnation as the knowledge that alone will save us from the fate that awaits us as believers in the various mistaken hypotheses that are handed out to us in the name of science and religion. The following extracts from a recent *Outlook* Editorial, under the heading of "The Law of Liberty" speak, almost, the language of Theosophy:

"Probably the popular conception of law is, A command issued to an inferior by a superior who has power to enforce obedience by the infliction of penalty. . . . It is not an adequate definition for a free people. For it assumes that the authority of law depends on the power of the superior to compel obedience, and involves the notion that might makes right.

"Law is not imposed from without by any authority, human or divine. It is wrought by the creator in the very substance of the creation. Natural law is in the nature of material things and material forces; the moral law is in the nature of man and his relations to others.

"These laws are self-enforcing."

* * * * * * * * * * *

"But the Bible is not a book of laws. It is a book of interpretations. The Ten Commandments do not make it wrong to kill, to steal, to commit adultery, to slander one's neighbor. The authority for the Ten Commandments does not depend on the question who first wrote them, or when or where they were written. They were written in the conscience of mankind long before they were written on stone. If they truly interpret the conscience, they are authoritative; if they do not truly interpret the conscience, they are not authoritative. The authority is in the soul of man.

"All intellectually sane men recognize the fact that natural law is universal. All morally sane men recognize the fact that moral law is universal. . . .

"Toward this universal law, whether natural or moral, three attitudes of mind are possible:

"We may disregard law and take the consequences.

"We may submit to law and avoid the perils of disregarding it.

"We may accept law and make it an instrument of power.

"Liberty is not freedom from law. It is not lawlessness. If it were it would be necessary to get outside the universe in order to gain liberty. For law pervades, controls, unifies, the universe."

There is nothing separative in the nature of Theosophy. From his unassailable basis the Theosophist welcomes all who would work in the true service of humanity without distinctions. Guided by the light of the three Fundamental Propositions as laid down by H. P. B., he measures and understands what is wheat and what chaff, what is eternally true and what false and fleeting in public opinion. What there is of truth must live and what there is of false has a certain end, so there is cause for rejoicing at so much of truth as a recognition of Law even if there is, garbled with that an erroneous perception in regard to Deity. If the desire to help humanity in its crying need is, as seems, the motive in the hearts of such writers as the above quoted, will not the Law bring them in the course of time into line with those principles which are the sub-stratum of logic and the epitome of knowledge?